

Professor Kenny, on behalf of the Student Relationships Committee, presented the annual report of this committee with Resolution #66/18 attached, and moved its adoption, seconded by Professor Lewis. Professor Sharpe, seconded by Professor Lewis, moved the following amendment: Delete the words "he should not be penalized" (line 4 of the resolving clause) and substitute "his grades should not be reduced." Professors Kenny and Lewis accepted this amendment. After further discussion and remarks to the question by Professors Wood, Allen and Willson, Professor Zuchelli suggested a further amendment, agreed to by Professors Kenny and Lewis, as follows: Delete the word "shall" (first word, second line of the resolving clause) and substitute the word "should." After some further discussion and remarks to the question by President Elliott and Vice President Bright, and a further amendment proposal by Professor Lewis which was not acceptable to the proposers, the Resolution carried unanimously as amended by Professors Sharpe, Lewis, and Zuchelli.

Professor Naeser, on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Performance and Development, presented the annual report of this committee with Resolution #66/19 attached, seconded by Professor Wood. An amendment was made to strike the word "less" (Par.2, line 1) of the resolving clause, and substitute the word "fewer"; strike the last three words "will be consulted" (Par. 2, resolving clause); add the words "and concurrence" after the word "assistance" (line 6, paragraph 2) so that the final sentence will read as follows: "The selection of such evaluators will be made with the assistance and concurrence of the school faculty personnel committee, or where such a committee has not been established, of the Committee on Faculty Performance and Development." After general discussion of this report and resolution, a vote was taken on the Resolution in two parts: Paragraph 1 carried with one objection, and Paragraph 2 carried unanimously.

Professor Reesing withdrew the Annual Report of the Committee on University Objectives (scheduled on the agenda for discussion at this meeting) with its attached resolution (#66/17), which is scheduled in amended form for action at the May meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

Frederick R. Houser  
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO SECURE FURTHER STUDY OF  
ALTERING THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR (66/20)

Be It Resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. The Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty is instructed to investigate the proposal to alter the University Calendar by advancing the Fall and Spring Semesters so that the Christmas Recess separates them, and to report its recommendations to the Senate.

---

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
CONCERNING ACADEMIC INTERACTION WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY  
By the Educational Policy Committee (66/16)

Whereas, conjoint growth and sustained interaction among the School and Departments is basic to the concept of a University and

Whereas, the resultant enrichment of educational experience should be a central concern of our educational policy, and

Whereas, such interaction is essential to the efficient employment of available resources of the University, and

Whereas, lack of suitable guidance has led to fragmentation, duplication of efforts in instruction and conflict of interest, with adverse effect,

Be It Then Resolved, that the University Senate affirms the educational policy of University-wide academic service by one department in its field of competence and interest, and

Be It Further Resolved, that the University Senate urges and requests that suitable guidance and leadership be provided and mechanisms be established to promote interaction and cooperative effort among the subdivisions of the University while reducing fragmentation or duplication of facilities or staff within an academic field of interest. The Senate requests the President of George Washington University initiate such measures as are required to effectuate this policy and these intents.

---

A RESOLUTION FOR A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE ON CLASS  
ABSENCES (66/18) (as amended)

Whereas (a) the faculty of The George Washington University adheres to the precept that the students of the university should be encouraged to develop self-reliance and mature judgment as two of the primary and ultimate aims of the educational experience; and

Whereas (b) the furthering of the above aims should in no way restrict or interfere with an instructor's freedom to control and define the essential requirements of his course, or courses, of study;

Therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

This Senate believes that in the assignment of evaluation criteria, a premium should be placed upon the satisfactory completion of the specific requirements established for each course, and that if a student is able to master said requirements, he shall not be penalized his grade should not be reduced for absence from class meetings, per se, it being understood that in certain courses, completion of said requirements demands continued and regular participation on the part of the student.

A RESOLUTION REGARDING CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION  
(66/19) (as amended)

Now therefore be it resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. That recognition for service to the University may be through promotion in rank or increase in salary, or both, but the primary basis for promotion in rank should reflect academic achievement.
2. That no ~~less~~ fewer than three persons who are qualified to make judgments in the field will make the evaluation of academic achievement. These persons should hold rank at least equivalent to the rank for which a candidate is being considered. If three qualified evaluators are not available in the department (or school) concerned, the appropriate dean will request the assistance of such evaluators from outside the department or outside the University. The selection of such evaluators will be made with the assistance and concurrence of the school faculty personnel committee or where such a committee has not been established, of the Committee on Faculty Performance and Development. ~~will be consulted.~~

A RESOLUTION REGARDING CRITERIA  
FOR PROMOTION (66/19)

Now therefore be it resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. That recognition for service to the University may be through promotion in rank or increase in salary, or both, but the primary basis for promotion in rank should reflect academic achievement.
2. That no fewer than three persons who are qualified to make judgments in the field will make the evaluation of academic achievement. These persons should hold rank at least equivalent to the rank for which a candidate is being considered. If three qualified evaluators are not available in the department (or school) concerned, the appropriate dean will request the assistance of such evaluators from outside the department or outside the University. The selection of such evaluators will be made with the assistance and concurrence of the school faculty personnel committee or where such a committee has not been established, of the Committee on Faculty Performance and Development.

The Committee on Faculty Performance and  
Development  
April 14, 1967  
Attached to annual report (as amended at meeting)

Par 1. Carried with 1 objection  
2. " unanimously

C

O

PY

President's Room

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

April 12, 1967

Members of the Middle States Evaluating Team have now completed their report to the Middle States Association and the Association has forwarded copies of the report to me. I am advised that the Association will take formal action on the report at a regular meeting on April 22. Until that time, the report is considered "informal" and does not commit the Association to any responsibility for any criticism or recommendation of the University. We are led to expect that the Association's formal action will be "approval of the report and reaccreditation of the University." Since the findings of the Team are of immediate interest, however, I am taking this means of distributing a summary. The points of commendation and the problems revealed are taken verbatim from the report itself. The following has not received any editing:

#### FOREWORD

". . . The report that was prepared by the university was searching, detailed, and objective. Together with the supplementary materials it presented an excellent picture of the university--what it is, where it hopes to go, and its plans to get there. If objectivity at times verged on self-criticism, the report nevertheless served its purpose admirably . . . .

#### INTRODUCTION

"In the most recent report of the president George Washington University is categorized as 'fortunate among urban institutions in its location' in Washington and, perhaps more importantly, in a neighborhood dominated by the White House and housing numerous government agencies and departments. The university, the report goes on, 'is a citizen of the federal city--a city serving at the same time a great international meeting ground.'

"This location is at one and the same time both a source of strength for the university and also of weakness. 'Washington has at any given moment a greater concentration of authorities in every field--scientific, governmental and humanistic--than can be found at any other single spot on the globe.' Since many of these authorities are interested in teaching, it is possible for the university to have a body of part-time faculty without parallel in the country. This is good, and instruction can be offered in narrowly specialized fields that would not be possible otherwise. But the part-time faculty member with rare exceptions teaches only and does not enter into the total life of the university in the way expected of the full-time faculty member. Without

particular effort faculty meetings cannot be attended, curriculum planning undertaken, students advised and discussions with colleagues enjoyed, and the part-time faculty member cannot make the extra-classroom contribution to the work of his department that is normally part of the functioning of his full-time fellow.

"There are other related pitfalls. Washington, for example, has a wealth of libraries perhaps unmatched in the world. Does that mean that George Washington University can depend almost exclusively on these libraries for the support of the scholarly research of its faculty and students and allow its own libraries to neglect this prime function of a university library? Or must it try to parallel the research collections of existing libraries in the area? Since neither position is really tenable, what is to be the balance between them, and how is it to be maintained?

"There is little need to belabor the point further. The university must avail itself of the advantages of its location while keeping to a minimum the disadvantages of doing so.

"The university, moreover, is presently at the junction of many different roads and is planning its future with care. It recognizes the usual three-fold obligation of a university--to transmit knowledge, to extend knowledge, and to serve society--but has the task of assessing these in the light of its own particular situation. Is this service to be directed to the local or the national community or, if both, what is the relative emphasis to be assigned to each? As a special aspect of this general issue, shall it serve primarily a full-time or a part-time student body? Or to be even more specific, should its student body be primarily resident or commuting? What is the relative emphasis to be placed on research as opposed to instruction? On the graduate student as compared with the undergraduate? On campus programs of instruction and research as compared with off-campus centers?

"There are many questions of this type that the university is trying to answer or for which the answer has been or is being thrust upon it. Its location in Washington obviously conditions many of the answers and cannot be escaped as the university makes the hard decisions which will govern its future. Some of these have been made--there are to be no new schools; others are yet to be made--what is the ultimate student population to be and how is it to be distributed between undergraduate and graduate and among the several schools? More will be made as the university embarks on the massive fund raising campaign implicit in the development program approved by the board of trustees at its meeting in January of this year. The shape of things to come, however, is known in general and is guiding the developments planned.

"During the years since the immediately preceding evaluation, George Washington University has made many steps to strengthen the

institution. That evaluation cited weaknesses and inadequacies in many phases of the university's policies, procedures, and operation. Some of these, such as the formulation of a clear definition of the duties and responsibilities of the faculty and its role in the governance of the university, have been corrected or eliminated; others, such as the glaring weakness of the library, especially in terms of the master's and doctoral programs offered, still persist with undiminished effect; still others, such as the purpose, policies, and mode of operation of the College of General Studies, have yielded in part to intensive study, committee deliberation, and official action.

"Because, despite the underlying strength of the institution, certain problem areas were evident, it was requested by the university that the present evaluation be of the project type. This was agreed to, and initially the university sought to have special and intensive attention directed to four areas: (1) the financing and resources of the institution, (2) codification of administrative duties and responsibilities, (3) the extension program of the College of General Studies, and (4) the structure of graduate work in arts and sciences and its relation to the undergraduate program. As the preparation of the self-study by the university proceeded, it became evident that it would be neither wise nor timely to wait for whatever help the comments of the evaluation team might provide in two of these areas: (1) the codification of administrative duties, and (2) the structure of graduate work. It was clear in the first case that with the reorganization taking place, an organization chart and a description of the principal administrative positions were needed as the work of the present academic year began. Each was prepared and approved and is presently in effect. Similarly, the organization of graduate work in the arts and sciences, it was felt, had to be changed and brought within one structure. As a result the Graduate Council, which had had responsibility for doctoral programs, was abolished and a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences responsible for all graduate work in the academic disciplines, both at the master's and the doctoral levels, instituted in its place.

"There were then two remaining areas for special study by the present team: the financing and resources of the university and the place of the College of General Studies in it.

"These two areas, quite obviously, could not be studied outside the context of the university. For that reason the team devoted a very considerable portion of its time and energy to developing a backdrop of general university policies, structure and operation against which the two specific problems to which it was asked to give special attention could be seen in proper perspective.

#### A CONCLUDING STATEMENT

"To conclude, there is much to commend in the present situation at George Washington University. The team would single out for special mention:

1. the faculty for preparing a clear Code (1964) and a Faculty Organization Plan (1965) which together provide mechanisms and procedures for registering the faculty voice on all points of substantive educational significance to the university;
2. the present administration for decentralizing budgetary responsibilities and thus requiring deans and their department chairmen to work effectively in developing their educational programs;
3. the president for reviving faculty and student morale, which had fallen to a dangerously low level;
4. the president and board of trustees for launching upon a carefully devised five-year plan of development;
5. the students for their thoughtful interest in and comments on operational factors affecting student activity and faculty evaluation;
6. the central administration for raising faculty salaries and for planning to meet the A.A.U.P. "A" average scale in each faculty rank on a university-wide basis by 1970-71; )
7. the central administration for appointing a librarian who may be one of the most significant persons in the beneficial development of the university;
8. the board of trustees for abolishing an athletic activity which was losing large sums of money which can better be used for developing educational programs;
9. the president for initiating the memoranda to the faculty relating actions of the board of trustees;
10. the central administration for reviewing all of the far flung activities of the university with the hope of consolidating to strength;
11. the central administration and faculty for the progress in making viable the Consortium of Universities;
12. the president for the quality of his high-level appointments in administrative areas.

"There are, of course, problems. No university is without them. The team again would single out for special mention:

1. the Library. This is unquestionably one of the weakest elements in the total academic structure of the university. It is inadequate in its collections, housed in inadequate space, and has insufficient staff to meet its responsibilities. The library cannot support the instructional and research programs of a major university striving to be in the first rank, and the solving of its problems must be given the highest priority as the university charts its future. The university cannot afford to wait for the construction of a new library building. Steps should be taken immediately--and there are moves that can be made--to make the library, within the space that can be made available to it and with additional staff, the effective instrument that a library should be in the total program of a university.

2. The College of General Studies. The university must decide what the place of the college in the future of the university is to be and whether, in fact, the university can afford the dissipation of its energies represented by the maintenance, supervision, and staffing of the many small centers of instruction which together form the college. Strength tends to come from a focusing of effort, and the university is not focusing its effort when the college maintains its many centers. A rationale must be developed which will make possible a decision as to whether a center or a given program is to be continued. The university, as stated in the most recent annual report of the president, accepts as one of its roles 'service of society.' How far this concept should extend is the point in question. The university must strike a balance between the lack of focus of its energies and the possible contribution to a given constituency or series of constituencies which the programs of the college represent.

This is particularly true as far as programs on the graduate level offered at remote centers are concerned. The good name of the university is involved, and the quality of its programs must be kept above reproach.

As one aspect of this, the place of HumRRO and its relationship to the university must be rationalized. Its present position vis-a-vis the university is not one which can be justified and steps should be taken either to spin it off, as corporations do with subsidiaries, or integrate it properly with the instructional and research programs of the university.

3. Plant. The need to proceed with all possible speed to construct new plant is obvious. Evidence is found in all segments of the campus, and the need includes, beyond a new library which should have highest priority, new space for science research and instruction, office space for faculty, proper space to house the activities of the dean of students' office, and space for a host of other important programs. Plans to create much of the space have been drawn, but they must be pursued vigorously and at once.

4. The structure of graduate study. The relationship between the new Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and other graduate programs requires study. There is no one accepted pattern for the organization of graduate study in this country, and the university will have to assess continually what it is doing in terms of its own structure and place in the total fabric of higher education in the Washington community. Thought should be given to the establishment of some one body in the university which would have responsibility for seeing that all graduate programs are properly related, where that is indicated, and function at the level of quality the university accepts for itself.

5. The board of trustees. The board of trustees has a key role to play in assuring the success of the development program which has been announced. The dimensions of that program are such that for its success the university will have to bring to bear upon it every possible source of strength. The board of trustees is a major source of this strength and its composition and mode of functioning should be studied to assure that it makes the contribution to the success of the development plan that it should. The program must not fail else the momentum which has been generated in the past year or more is going to be lost and the university in consequence suffer a serious setback. The board must get wholeheartedly into the program, understand it, support it, and work for it. Only thus can a program of this magnitude have any possibility of success.

6. The faculty. Despite a feeling on the part of many faculty that a new day has, in fact, dawned for the university, there is a large measure of faculty apathy which perhaps could be better described as an attitude of 'wait and see.' To overcome this apathy, the role of the faculty in the governance of the institution should be made more explicit in a variety of ways, and the important place they hold in the total university community made evident by further steps of the type initiated so well by President Elliott in the Memorandum to the Faculty, in which he reported on the actions taken by the board of trustees at its meeting in January, 1967.

The senate as the key faculty body needs to become more self-critical than is presently the case and try to determine whether, in fact, it is making all the contribution it can to the development of the university. Without changing its charter but merely by taking advantage of the powers it presently has, it can be and should be a more effective instrument in that development.

7. Office for Resources. The office of the vice president for resources needs more personnel and a greatly augmented budget. It has a major part to play in the development program of the university, and despite the decision to use fund raising organizations for special projects, still has a tremendous assignment in the staff work for these organizations and the programs the university itself is undertaking. The augmented personnel should be both professional and clerical. Organization is the key to success in any development program, but organization in turn requires organized data. Only with additional staff can there be the data required if the development program is to be successful.

8. An office of institutional planning. There is a clear need for an office of institutional planning in a rapidly developing institution. The studies undertaken by such an office are of great importance; particularly is this the case where program budgeting is being introduced. In fact, there is some question whether program budgeting can be successful in the absence of the type of data that would be furnished by such an office.

#### L'ENVOI

"Despite these problems George Washington University is under way. Its course has been charted, personnel selected, and resources mobilized. It has extremely effective leadership supplied by the president, an increasing understanding of its role on the part of the board of trustees, and faculties ready to move ahead. With the sense of direction and dynamism of the president, the university can look forward with confidence to the attainment of ever higher levels of excellence."

(sgd) Lloyd H. Elliott

6 April 1967

The University Senate will meet at 2:10 p.m., April 14, 1967 in the Faculty Conference Room, Library Building.

AGENDA: I. Approval of the minutes of the last meeting.

II. Comments on the report: "An Evaluation of The George Washington University" submitted to the Commission of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools by the team which visited GW during the first week of February 1967 - President Elliott.

III. Annual Reports of Standing Committees:

A. With resolutions attached:

1. Educational Policy - Professor Zuchelli - Resolution #66/16  
PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY CONCERNING ACADEMIC INTER-ACTION WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY.
2. Student Relationships - Professor Kenny - Resolution #66/18  
A RESOLUTION FOR A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE ON CLASS ABSENCES
3. Faculty Performance and Development - Professor Naeser - #66/1  
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION
4. University Objectives - Professor Reesing - Resolution #66/17  
ENDORsing THE COMMENTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY OBJECTIV  
ON TECHNOLOGY AND THE MODERN UNIVERSITY.

B. All others

IV. Special Report of the Administrative Matters Committee with Resolution #66/20 - ALTERING THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR - Professor Sharpe.

V. Report of the Nominating Committee to Elect an Executive Committee for the 1967/68 Session. Further nominations may be made from the floor.

VI. Election of the Executive Committee.

FREDERICK R. HOUSER  
SECRETARY

A RESOLUTION TO SECURE FURTHER STUDY OF ALTERING THE  
UNIVERSITY CALENDAR (66/20)

Be It Resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. The Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty is instructed to investigate the proposal to alter the University Calendar by advancing the Fall and Spring Semesters so that the Christmas Recess separates them, and to report its recommendations to the Senate.

Committee on Administrative Matters As  
They Affect the Faculty

April 14, 1967

Attached to Special Report

Suggested 1968-1969 University Calendar--Senate Administrative Matters Committee

1968

	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	
	Sep H-2	R-3	R-4	5	6	7	H:Labor Day
	9	10	11	12	13	14	
	16	17	18	19	20	21	
	23	24	25	26	27	28	
	30	Oct 1	2	3	4	5	
FALL SEMESTER	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	14	15	16	17	18	19	
	21	22	23	24	25	26	
	28	29	30	31	Nov 1	2	
	4	5	6	7	8	9	
	H-11	12	13	14	15	16	H:Vets Day
	18	19	20	21	22	23	
	25	26	27	H-28	H-29	H-30	H:Thanksgiving
Dec	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	9	10	11	12	13	14	
	16	17	18	19	20	21	
	23	24	H-25	26	27	28	H:Christmas
1969	30	31	Jan H-1	2	3	4	H:New Year's

1969

	6	R-7	R-8	9	10	11	
	13	14	15	16	17	18	
	20	21	22	23	24	25	
	27	28	29	30	31	Feb 1	
	3	4	5	6	7	8	
SPRING SEMESTER	10	11	12	13	14	15	
	17	18	19	20	21	H-22	H:G W's Birthday
	24	25	26	27	28	Mar 1	
	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	10	11	12	13	14	15	
	17	18	19	20	21	22	
	24	25	26	27	28	29	
	31	Apr 1	2	3	H-4	H-5	Easter 6th
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	14	15	16	17	18	19	
	21	22	23	24	25	26	
	28	29	30	May 1	2	3	
	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	12	13	14	15	16	17	
	19	20	21	22	23	24	
	26	27	28	29	H-30	31	H:Memorial Day
JUN	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	9	10	11	12	13	14	
SUMMER SESSIONS	16	17	18	19	20	21	
	23	24	25	26	27	28	
	30	Jul 1	2	3	H-4	5	H:Independence Day
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	14	15	16	17	18	19	
	21	22	23	24	25	26	
	28	29	30	31	Aug 1	2	
	4	5	6	7	8	9	
	11	12	13	14	15	16	
	18	19	20	21	22	23	
	25	26	27	28	29	30	
	Sep H-1	R-2	R-3	4	5	6	H:Labor Day

A RESOLUTION FOR A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE ON CLASS ABSENCES (66/18)

Whereas (a) the faculty of The George Washington University adheres to the precept that the students of the university should be encouraged to develop self-reliance and mature judgment as two of the primary and ultimate aims of the educational experience; and

Whereas (b) the furthering of the above aims should in no way restrict or interfere with an instructor's freedom to control and define the essential requirements of his course, or courses, of study;

Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

~~Should~~ This Senate believes that in the assignment of evaluation criteria, a premium shall be placed upon the satisfactory completion of the specific requirements established for each course, and that if a student is able to master said requirements, he shall not be penalized for absence from class meetings, per se, it being understood that in certain courses, completion of said requirements demands continued and regular participation on the part of the student.

Student Relationships Committee  
April 14, 1967  
Attached to Annual Report

*his grade should shall not be reduced*

A RESOLUTION REGARDING CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION (66/19)

Now therefore be it resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. That recognition for service to the University may be through promotion in rank or increase in salary, or both, but the primary basis for promotion in rank should reflect academic achievement.
2. That no ~~less~~ <sup>fewer</sup> than three persons who are qualified to make judgments in the field will make the evaluation of academic achievement. These persons should hold rank at least equivalent to the rank for which a candidate is being considered. If three qualified evaluators are not available in the department (or school) concerned, the appropriate dean will request the assistance of such evaluators from outside the department or outside the University. The selection of such evaluators will be made with the assistance of the school faculty personnel committee or where such a committee has not been established, <sup>of</sup> the Committee on Faculty Performance and Development, ~~will be consulted.~~

*and concurrence*

The Committee on Faculty Performance and Development  
April 14, 1967  
Attached to Annual Report

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY  
SENATE - APRIL 14, 1967

The University Senate met at 2:10 p.m., Friday, April 14, 1967, President Elliott presiding.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved without exception.

President Elliott distributed a summary (see attached) of the salient features of the report of the Middle States Visiting Team which is self-explanatory. Six copies of the complete report (70 pages) will be given to the Chairman of the Executive Committee to be made available for reading on a confidential basis by members of the Senate and other full-time faculty members in the office of the Secretary, Building C.

Professor Sharpe, on behalf of the Administrative Matters Committee, presented the SPECIAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE REGARDING PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR, with attached resolution #66/20, and moved its adoption, seconded by Professor Kenny. After considerable discussion, Dean Kramer suggested the possibility that the proposed changes in the calendar might conflict with the requirements of the Association of American Law Schools, Professors Reesing and Brewer supported the report and the resolution, Professor Heller questioned the effect of such a calendar on faculty terms of appointments and salaries, and Mr. Houser questioned the feasibility of the target dates, following which the Resolution was voted and unanimously carried.

On motions seconded and carried, the following members of the Senate were unanimously elected to serve on the Executive Committee for the 1967/68 Session:

Richard C. Allen	(Law)
Seymour Alpert	(Medicine)
Galip M. Arkilic	(Engineering)
Robert C. Willson	(Columbian College)
* Reuben E. Wood, Chairman	(Columbian College)

Professor Zuchelli, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, presented the Annual Report of the Committee with attached Resolution #66/16 and moved its adoption, seconded by Professor Willson. After prolonged discussion of the report and remarks to the question by Professors dePian and Heller who supported the resolution but took exception to statements contained in the report referring to the School of Engineering and Applied Science, Professor Heller urged that the report be removed from the Senate records and Professor Zuchelli rose to defend the report as the carefully considered work of his committee and stated that the report should be retained as part of the official record of the Senate. Professor Lewis requested some clarification of other areas of the problems discussed in the report, pointing out the difficulty in establishing jurisdiction in courses such as Business Law and Business Economics in the School of Law, the School of Government and Business, and in the Department of Economics. After further discussion, Professor Allen rose to point out that the Senate was taking no action upon the report at this time but merely upon the resolution attached to it. Dr. Alpert then moved the question, and the Resolution was unanimously adopted.